Application No.: 10/590,198
 Docket No.: 0925-0233PUSI

 Amendment dated June 18, 2010
 Page 8 of 12

 Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2010
 Page 8 of 12

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 8. Please replace the original sheet of drawings including Figure 8 with the attached replacement sheet corresponding thereto. An annotated sheet is provided showing the changes made to Figure 8.

Docket No.: 0925-0233PUS1 Page 9 of 12 Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2010

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-14 are now present in this application. Claims 1 and 8 are independent.

Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 13, and 14 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Specification and Drawings

Applicants have amended the specification to correct a typographical error. Further, Applicants have amended Figure 8 in the drawings to clarify the subject matter illustrated therein. An annotated sheet is attached showing the changes to Figure 8.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to the specification and the drawings do not add any new matter to the present application,

Claim Amendments

Applicants have amended the claims in order to correct minor typographical errors, and to place the claims in better form. The claim amendments are not being made in response to any statutory requirement for patentability, and have not been narrowed in scope. Instead, the claims have been amended merely to recite the subject matter therein more clearly.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatano (US 6,951,031) in view of Mukai et al. (US 2003/0152360). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

Independent claims 1 and 8 require searching the electronic program-guide information related to a broadcast program for a predetermined extension keyword indicating a program extension or delay. In the rejection, the Examiner admits that Hatano fails to disclose such searching (see Office Action at page 3). However, the Examiner cites to Mukai as teaching "a searching means unit (14) operable to search a character string in a predetermined region of the
 Application No.: 10/590,198
 Docket No.: 0925-0233PUS1

 Amendment dated June 18, 2010
 Page 10 of 12

Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2010

electric program guide including the set broadcast time and broadcast channel," citing to paragraphs 0027-0028 among others (see id.). These paragraphs are reproduced below:

"[0027] Moreover, when timer-controlled video recording is set on a time-series data recording device, there may be the case where broadcast time is changed due to extension of a program precedent to a desired program for such timer-controlled video recording. In this case, some announcements to inform thereof should be made presumably. Therefore, it is satisfactory if setting time for the timer-controlled video recording is changed on the basis of such announcement information.

[0028] Meanwhile, it is possible to recognize the predetermined keyword by use of at least one piece of information out of voice information, caption text data, image data, and the like, which are included in the broadcast information and the like. When the keyword is recognized, firstly, the data stored in the buffer memory are outputted (reproduced). Thereafter, data recorded (image-recorded) in a normal storage unit are outputted (reproduced).

(emphasis added).

In the above passage, Mukai discloses performing a keyword search on the "voice information, caption text data, image data, and the like, which are included in the broadcast information," i.e., the <u>actual content</u> data of a broadcast program, for a keyword. Specifically, Mukai is searching the content of the broadcast program to determine whether an announcement of an extension is included in the program itself. This is different than performing a keyword search of the <u>electronic program-guide</u> (EPG) information of a broadcast program, as would be understood by persons of ordinary skill.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Hatano and Mukai, whether considered separately or in obvious combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed element of searching the EPG information related to a broadcast program for a predetermined extension keyword indicating a program extension or delay, as recited in the independent claims. As such, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 8 recite a combination of elements which are neither disclosed nor made obvious by the prior art of record. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 8.

Application No.: 10/590,198 Docket No.: 0925-0233PUS1 Amendment dated June 18, 2010 Page 11 of 12

Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2010

With regard to dependent claims 2, 4, 9, and 11, Applicants submit that these claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 8 which are allowable for the

reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 2, 4, 9, and 11 are allowable based on their

dependence from claims 1 and 8. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully

requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 3, 5-7, 10, and 12-14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter

in this application.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all

presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present

application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in

condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present

application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jason W. Rhodes, Registration No. 47305 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to

expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

 Application No.: 10/590,198
 Docket No.: 0925-0233PUSI

 Amendment dated June 18, 2010
 Page 12 of 12

 Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2010
 Page 12 of 12

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: June 18, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael K Mutter

Registration No.: 29680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP 8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

703-205-8000

Attachments